| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--|---|
| | 10/632,823 | VENKATACHALAM, VIDYA |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Nathan Bloom | 2624 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application | · |
| (1) <u>Nathan Bloom</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Paul Tsou</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 11 September 2007 | Time: <u>09:30 am</u> | • |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | olicant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| | · | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| · . | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| • | | |
| Part II. | | • |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE Examiner initiated interview to inquire if a reply had been file to notify applicant that the six month limit for response had p | d in response to the Non-Final re | jection mailed out on 02/27/2007, and |
| Part III. | • | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sumination. | The examiner will provide a attention to the substance of the substance of | written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| MI SIL NB | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |